

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER HANSEN,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No. 1:22-cv-1002
)	
)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
KALSEE CREDIT UNION,)	
Defendant.)	
)	

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT & RECOMMENDATION

Plaintiff commenced this action on October 27, 2022. Because Plaintiff was permitted to proceed as a pauper (ECF No. 4), Magistrate Judge Green reviewed Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine if it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Upon his review, rather than immediately recommending that the matter be dismissed, Judge Green issued an order giving Plaintiff the opportunity to file an amended complaint because the original complaint is illegible (*see* ECF No. 5). Plaintiff then submitted a "response" to this order, which was also illegible (*see* ECF No. 6). Because both the complaint and the response are illegible and the Court cannot discern the nature of the alleged facts or Plaintiff's claims for relief, Judge Green issued a Report & Recommendation ("R&R"), recommending dismissal of Plaintiff's complaint (ECF No. 7). Plaintiff was given fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations per 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2), and he subsequently filed an objection (ECF No. 8). Just like Plaintiff's complaint and the response

to Judge Green's order, the objection is illegible. Therefore, the Court will adopt the R&R and terminate this matter.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). “[A]n objection that does nothing more than state a disagreement with the magistrate’s suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an ‘objection’ as that term is used in the context of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72.” *Brown v. City of Grand Rapids*, No. 16-2433, 2017 WL 4712064, at *2 (6th Cir. June 16, 2017).

Plaintiff’s complaint (ECF No. 1), his response to Judge Green’s order permitting him to file an amended, legible complaint (ECF No. 6), and his objection to the R&R (ECF No. 8), are all illegible. The Court cannot decipher Plaintiff’s claims for relief nor the facts upon which these claims rely. The Court afforded Plaintiff the opportunity to submit a legible complaint so his matter could be fully adjudicated, but he failed to do so. Thus, the Court will adopt the R&R and dismiss this matter for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 7) as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and this matter is **TERMINATED**.

Judgment to follow.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: November 10, 2022

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge